DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 555 CS 012 743

AUTHOR Pellegrini, A. D.; Galda, Lee
TITLE The Role of Close Relationships in Early Literacy Learning: Towards a Working Model. Reading Research Report No. 80.
INSTITUTION National Reading Research Center, Athens, GA.; National Reading Research Center, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 97
CONTRACT 117A20007
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Processes; Elementary Education; *Friendship; *Literacy; Models; Reading Research; Research Needs; *Social Development; *Social Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Literacy as a Social Process

ABSTRACT

As part of an attempt to precisely clarify the role of social context in early literacy development, this paper presents a working theoretical model for the ways in which one form of close social relationship, friendship, relates to early school-based literacy. The paper defines friendship as a dyadic, mutual relationship. The paper suggests that the emotional climate of trust and mutuality characteristic of friendships supports cognitive conflict and subsequent resolution. These processes, in turn, afford opportunities for children to reflect upon the linguistic and cognitive processes that constitute school-based literacy. The paper concludes with a discussion of implications for future research. Contains 63 references. (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 555

The Role of Close Relationships in Early Literacy Learning: Towards a Working Model

A. D. Pellegrini
Lee Galda
University of Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 012743

NRRC
National Reading Research Center

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 80
Winter 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NRRC

National Reading Research Center

The Role of Close Relationships in Early Literacy Learning: Toward a Working Model

A. D. Pellegrini
Lee Galda
University of Georgia

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 80
Winter 1997

The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Center Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

NRRC National Reading Research Center

Executive Committee
Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
University of Georgia
John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
University of Maryland College Park
James F. Baumann, Associate Director
University of Georgia
Patricia S. Koskinen, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Jamie Lynn Metsala, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia
John F. O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia R. Hynd
University of Georgia
Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Clarke County School District, Athens, Georgia
Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Publications Editors

Research Reports and Perspectives
Linda DeGroff, Editor
University of Georgia
James V. Hoffman, Associate Editor
University of Texas at Austin
Mariam Jean Dreher, Associate Editor
University of Maryland College Park
Instructional Resources
Lee Galda, *University of Georgia*
Research Highlights
William G. Holliday
University of Maryland College Park
Policy Briefs
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Videos
Shawn M. Glynn, *University of Georgia*

NRRC Staff
Barbara F. Howard, Office Manager
Kathy B. Davis, Senior Secretary
University of Georgia

Barbara A. Neitzey, Administrative Assistant
Valerie Tyra, Accountant
University of Maryland College Park

National Advisory Board
Phyllis W. Aldrich
Saratoga Warren Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Saratoga Springs, New York
Arthur N. Applebee
State University of New York, Albany
Ronald S. Brandt
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Marshá T. DeLain
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
Carl A. Grant
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Barbara McCombs
Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (MCREL)
Luis C. Moll
University of Arizona
Carol M. Santa
School District No. 5
Kalispell, Montana
Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education
Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Rutgers University
Peter Winograd
University of Kentucky

Production Editor
Katherine P. Hutchison
University of Georgia

Assistant Production Editor
Jennifer Moon
University of Georgia

Dissemination Coordinator
Jordana E. Rich
University of Georgia

Text Formatter
Angela R. Wilson
University of Georgia

NRRC - University of Georgia
318 Aderhold
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674 Fax: (706) 542-3678
INTERNET: NRRC@uga.cc.uga.edu

NRRC - University of Maryland College Park
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 405-8035 Fax: (301) 314-9625
INTERNET: NRRC@umail.umd.edu

About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. *Research Reports* communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The *Perspective Series* presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. *Instructional Resources* include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
318 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8035

NRRC Editorial Review Board

Peter Afflerbach
University of Maryland College Park

Jane Agee
University of Georgia

JoBeth Allen
University of Georgia

Janice F. Almasi
University of Buffalo-SUNY

Patty Anders
University of Arizona

Harriette Arrington
University of Kentucky

Marlia Banning
University of Utah

Jill Bartoli
Elizabethtown College

Eurydice Bauer
University of Georgia

Janet Benton
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Irene Blum
Pine Springs Elementary School
Falls Church, Virginia

David Bloome
Vanderbilt University

John Borkowski
Notre Dame University

Fenice Boyd
University of Georgia

Karen Bromley
Binghamton University

Martha Carr
University of Georgia

Suzanne Clewell
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Joan Coley
Western Maryland College

Michelle Commeyras
University of Georgia

Linda Cooper
Shaker Heights City Schools
Shaker Heights, Ohio

Karen Costello
Connecticut Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Jim Cunningham
Gibsonville, North Carolina

Karin Dahl
Ohio State University

Marcia Delany
Wilkes County Public Schools
Washington, Georgia

Lynne Diaz-Rico
California State University-San Bernardino

Mark Dressman
New Mexico State University

Ann Duffy
University of Georgia

Ann Egan-Robertson
Amherst College

Jim Flood
San Diego State University

Dana Fox
University of Arizona

Linda Gambrell
University of Maryland College Park

Mary Graham
McLean, Virginia

Rachel Grant
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Guzzetti
Arizona State University

Frances Hancock
Concordia College of Saint Paul, Minnesota

Kathleen Heubach
Virginia Commonwealth University

Sally Hudson-Ross
University of Georgia

Cynthia Hynd
University of Georgia

Gay Ivey
University of Georgia

David Jardine
University of Calgary

Robert Jimenez
University of Oregon

Michelle Kelly
University of Utah

James King
University of South Florida

Kate Kirby
Georgia State University

Linda Labbo
University of Georgia

Michael Law
University of Georgia

Donald T. Leu
Syracuse University

Susan Lytle
University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann
University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey
University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain
University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls
University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis
University of Maryland

Mike McKenna
Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove
Fourth Street Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth B. Moje
University of Utah

Lesley Morrow
Rutgers University

Bruce Murray
Auburn University

Susan Neuman
Temple University

John O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney
University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps
Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle
Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince
Berry College

Gaoyin Qian
Lehman College–CUNY

Tom Reeves
University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler
New York University

Mary Roe
University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz
California State University-
Sacramento

Olivia Saracho
University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel
University of Georgia

Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Barnett Shoals Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Bernard Spodek
University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre
University of Georgia

Steve Stahl
University of Georgia

Roger Stewart
Boise State University

Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research
and Improvement

Louise Tomlinson
University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker
Eastern Montana University–Billings

Louise Waynant
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dera Weaver
Athens Academy
Athens, Georgia

Jane West
Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allan Wigfield
University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong
University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young
University of Georgia

Hallie Yopp
California State University

About the Authors

A. D. Pellegrini is Professor of Early Childhood Education at the University of Georgia and an investigator with the National Reading Research Center. He received his Ph.D. from Ohio State University and has also taught at the University of Rhode Island. His research and teaching interests center around children's development in school and family contexts.

Lee Galda is Professor of Language Education at the University of Georgia and an investigator with the National Reading Research Center. She received her Ph.D. from New York University and has written widely in the areas of early literacy and children's response to literature.

National Reading Research Center
Universities of Georgia and Maryland
Reading Research Report No. 80
Winter 1997

The Role of Close Relationships in Early Literacy Learning: Toward a Working Model

A. D. Pellegrini
Lee Galda
University of Georgia

Abstract. *As part of an attempt to precisely clarify the role of social context in early literacy development, we present a working theoretical model for the ways in which one form of close social relationship, friendship, relates to early school-based literacy. Friendship is defined as a dyadic, mutual relationship. We suggest that the emotional climate of trust and mutuality characteristic of friendships supports cognitive conflict and subsequent resolution. These processes, in turn, afford opportunities for children to reflect upon the linguistic and cognitive processes that constitute school-based literacy. Implications for future research are suggested.*

Researchers are currently concerned with the social context in which children's school-based literacy, as well as more general cognitive processing, develops. Frequently, Vygotskian (1978) or Piagetian (Perret-Clermont & Brossard, 1985; Piaget, 1983) theory is invoked to explain the ways in which supplementary (e.g., adult-child) or complementary (e.g., peer) relations facilitate cognitive processes. In both Piagetian and Vygotskian cases, the theories propose that cognitive development is the result of co-construction of knowledge between participants. To our knowledge, most studies do not explicate the specific dimensions of these social configurations that might afford literacy learning. Here we explore the importance of two specific aspects of the peer social contexts: contacts with diverse social actors and close relationships. We suggest that one type of close relationship between peers, friendship, may be an especially important social configuration in early school-based literacy learning.

Early literacy is a particularly interesting construct in which to study the role of social interaction in cognitive processes. Specifically, social interaction processes influence self-regulating, or "meta," processes, such as planning, monitoring, and checking outcomes in problem-solving situations (Hartup, 1985; Perret-Clermont & Brossard, 1985). These meta psychological processes can play an important role in children's school-based literacy learning. Further, performance on the sorts of tasks typically used in school-based literacy events support the use of the "meta" processes associated with peer interaction. Performance on open-ended tasks, such as

those frequently found in North American school literacy learning events (e.g., story writing and story telling, pretend play, and general talk about books), seems most susceptible to the forms of talk that spur cognitive change (e.g., disagreements/agreements [Kruger, Yebra, & Willis, 1995] and talk about language and cognitive processes).

We center our model on Piaget's equilibration theory where cognitive growth is stimulated by the conceptual conflict and resolution inherent in much peer interaction. We explore the ways in which two sorts of peer contexts, diverse and close relationships, stimulate cognitive and linguistic processes constitutive of early school-based literacy. We first define what we mean by early literacy. Next, we explore the role of diverse social contacts in the cognitive and linguistic decentering that is important for school literacy. Then, we argue that it is the close relationships within these diverse social networks that might be particularly important for literacy development. We suggest that the emotional tenor of friendship affords conceptual conflict and resolution; these processes are typically accompanied by talk about corresponding emotional states (e.g., That makes me *sad*). When friends talk about such emotional states they "cool" (Bruner, 1987) the emotions, enabling them to reflect upon the linguistic and cognitive processes important in school-based literacy learning.

The social context for literacy learning is multifaceted and complex, as researchers such as Dyson (1989; 1993), Galda (Galda, Shockley, Pellegrini, & Stahl, 1995), Lensmire (1994), and Baghban (1984; 1989) have shown. One important factor, according to this research, is the influence of peers. Peers, however, is a fairly global construct in much of this research. Here we focus more clearly on two aspects of the peer system: diversity of social contacts and mutual friendships. By discussing only these two dimensions of the peer system, we do not imply that they are the only important aspects of social context. Rather, we seek to precisely elaborate the concept of peers in literacy learning contexts. We also limit our discussion to the sort of literacy that is often taught in North American schools (see Galda et al., 1995; Lensmire, 1994, for two examples). While we recognize there are a variety of literacies, such as literacies for music, map reading, mathematical notation systems, as well as a variety of alphabetic literacies, we are interested in exploring the role of peers in literacy learning in typical North American classrooms. That we present one model, or path, by which children may become literate should not be interpreted as excluding other possible routes to literacy. We, like other developmentalists (Martin & Caro, 1985; Piaget, 1983; Sackett, Sameroff, Cairns, & Suomi, 1981), endorse the notion of equifinality in development, which states that organisms reach developmental hallmarks via a variety of routes. Such flexibility seems necessary if organisms are to develop, and survive, in the varied environments that they inhabit. Thus, our working model is one of many that describes the process of becoming literate in certain types of schools. There are certainly different routes to literacy in the same types of schools and certainly different routes to literacy in different settings. Human beings and

their ecological niches are too complex to suggest anything else.

The model presented is a working model. This implies that much more research is needed before the parameters are more exactly specified. As will become evident, very little research has examined the theoretical or empirical implications of close relationships for early literacy. This paper, hopefully, will stimulate research in this area.

School-Based Literacy: A Developmental Definition

We and others (Galda, Cullinan, & Strickland, 1993; Olson, 1977; Pellegrini & Galda, 1993; Schiefflein & Cochran-Smith, 1981) have argued that school-based literacy is a broadly defined and culturally bound event governed by predictable social rules. Some children learn these rules very early, typically at home, while others have a difficult time learning these rules. The culturally bound nature of school-based literacy is partially responsible for this state. Most generally, school literacy involves reading and writing specific forms of texts and talking in certain ways about those texts, most of which have been prescribed by schools. Children are frequently expected to read trade books, often in the narrative genre, write about those stories and other experiences in story-like frames, and talk with the teacher in specific ways about these texts (Galda et al., 1995). These rule-governed interactions around text in school have been labelled "literacy events" (Heath, 1983). A paradigm example of this sort of interaction is the recitation discussion in which teachers ask students known information questions about a text. Thus, students come to recognize the following rules: Questions are posed by teachers about a book; teachers often have a specific answer in mind; children are expected to present answers to these questions in a specific format.

Our developmental orientation in defining literacy involves taking design features of school literacy, or the rules governing interaction around written language, and locating them in the oral language and speech events of children before they enter school. Our selection of design features of school-based literacy events is derived from fields as diverse as sociology (Bernstein, 1972), anthropology (Heath, 1983; Schiefflein & Cochran-Smith, 1981), language and literacy studies, and cognitive developmental psychology (Olson, 1977). Accordingly, we consider "literate talk" or "literate language" to be one developmental precursor to school-based literacy, generally, and reading and writing, specifically. Descriptively, literate language is a situationally sensitive language variant, or register (DeStefano, 1972; Halliday, 1978), which conveys meaning explicitly, with minimal contextual reliance. This register has the following features: Meaning is explicit (e.g., elaborated noun phrases) and lexicalized (e.g., through endophora), and clauses are conjoined with a variety of conjunctions; what Halliday and Hasan (1976) called cohesive text. Additionally, as part of the meaning explication process, literate language involves talk about talk as well as talk about cognitive processes.

We take this talk about cognitive and linguistic processes and states as evidence that

children are reflecting upon these processes and states (Dunn, 1988; Pellegrini, Galda, Shockley, & Stahl, 1995). Children's use of such terms as *think*, *read*, and *say* is indicative of their meta awareness of the processes governing reading and writing. The importance of children's use of the meta terms in traditional school-based reading and writing status is reflected in the robust finding that children's ability to reflect upon the language and mental processes, as evidenced by children's talk about these processes (Adams, 1990; Pellegrini & Galda, 1991; Scarborough, 1995) is predictive of success in school-based reading. Adams's (1990) synthesis of the early literacy literature clearly supports the importance of metalinguistic awareness in early school-based reading.

The importance of these particular aspects of literate language, however, is probably an artifact of the ways in which literacy is typically taught in many North American schools. For example, reading and writing are often taught around a specific literary genre, the narrative (Galda et al., 1993), with reading and writing being taught by composing, reading, and discussing texts and using language to label words, letters, and sounds. Literate language is also observed in classrooms, which makes oral talk between peers and between children and adults a crucial part of literacy teaching (Galda, Shockley, Pellegrini, & Stahl, 1995). In preschool, kindergarten, and first-grade classrooms, teachers encourage children to use literate language as they talk about the books they read and about the texts they write (Galda et al., 1995).

To sum up our conceptualization of school-based literacy, young children's use of literate language reliably predicts their performance on traditional measures of reading and writing (Dickinson & Moreton, 1991; Pellegrini & Galda, 1991). This finding is probably due to the fact that this register shares design features with language used in school-based literacy events. In light of this orientation in many schools, it should hardly be surprising that children who can talk about language also learn to read and write quite easily (Adams, 1990). Simply put: The design features of literate language match the design features of the ways in which literacy is typically taught in schools; thus, the probable reason for the predictive importance of the form of language.

The Peer Context: Diverse and Close Relationships

Talk, of course, needs an audience, and in many classrooms peers make up that audience. Here we describe two dimensions of the peer system that support children's use of literate language. We discuss diverse peer contacts first, noting that not all peers are equally supportive of literate language. We then suggest that children's friendships may be one social configuration that is especially supportive of literate language.

Diverse Contacts

A number of researchers, such as the British sociologist Basil Bernstein (1960) and Piagetian-oriented researchers (Pellegrini et al., 1995) have examined relations between the variety of children's social contacts, or social networks, and learning literate language.

Theoretically, variety of interlocutors may be important because when children communicate with different people, ambiguity often arises. In order to communicate meaning unambiguously, speakers must consider, or accommodate, others' points of view (Bernstein, 1960; Pellegrini et al., 1995). A basic premise of this orientation, following equilibration theory, is that interacting with a variety of peers facilitates conceptual conflict, resolution, and growth. Conceptual conflict, which is the product of being confronted with ambiguous social meaning, leads to social and cognitive decentering, or the ability to see and talk about events from different perspectives. Literate language, especially that dimension that involves meta talk, is an indicator of decentering. When children interact with peers, compared to adults, they are more willing to disagree (Piaget, 1962). Thus, variety of peer interlocutors should facilitate literate language.

An example of this sort of talk between kindergartners is helpful to illustrate our point. Take two children (Anna and Jessica) playing with a doctor kit and dolls:

A: It's (the doll's) sick.
J: *It's* sick?
A: Yeah. The doll. It's sick. Look. I think she's sick 'cause she's got a tempy.
J: Yeah, so she needs a shot.
A: No! She hates them!
J: Then don't tell her! Say: Close her eyes and it'll only hurt a minute. Then it'll be better.
A: Yeah. OK. OK, honey, Mommy wants you to close your eyes. Don't be scared. You'll feel better.

This example includes instances of verbal explication (e.g., *It's* being defined as *the doll*), and conceptual conflict (e.g., disagreeing on the need for a shot), and resolution (e.g., you're right). Also note that such conflict-resolution cycles involve children accommodating others' perspectives. In the process of resolving the conflict children typically employ rather sophisticated reasoning, as evidenced by adversative (*but*) and temporal (*then*) conjunctions. Further, children talk about talk (*say* and *tell*) and mental states (*thinks*, *wants*).

That diverse social experiences relate to cognitive decentering is supported in the experimental work with children's role playing: Taking a variety of different roles facilitates children's social-cognitive decentering (Burns & Brainerd, 1979; Christie & Johnsen, 1983; Piaget, 1962; Rosen, 1974). The naturalistic literature in children's play also supports the claim that taking a variety of roles facilitates children taking differentiated perspectives and the use of literate language (Pellegrini et al., 1995).

Not all peers, however, are equally supportive of the conceptual conflict and resolution cycles that support literate language. Close peer relationships, or reciprocal friendships, may provide a particularly supportive venue for using literate language.

Close Relationships

Interactions vary between peers in different relationships (Hinde, 1978), where relationships are defined as dyads whose specific histories of interactions influence their present and future interactions. Here we concentrate on

a discussion of a specific close peer relationship—reciprocal friendship. While other close relationships between children, such as sibling relationships, may be important for social understanding (Dunn, 1988) and literacy learning (Baghban, 1984), we consider friendship because it is an important part of children's social lives at school (see Dyson, 1989, 1993; Lensmire, 1994, for discussions of the peer world in schools).

Our presentation of the role of peers, friendships, and literacy, however, differs from many discussions of peer influences on literacy learning. In much of this literature the nature of the peer relationship is not considered explicitly: A peer is a peer. Where differences are considered, they relate to differences in expertise; for example, conservers interact with nonconservers (Murray, 1972). Even when the term friendship is used (Dyson, 1989, 1993; Lensmire, 1994), it is used globally with friendship not explicated. In most cases, peers and friends are not differentiated theoretically. In some places it is used synonymously with peers who share classroom space. The unstated assumption here is that when children interact with each other or occupy the same space, they are friends.

In other cases, friendship and popularity are conflated (Bukowski & Hoza, 1989). We define friendship as a reciprocal, dyadic relationship operationalized by reciprocal peer nominations of friendship (Hartup, 1996). Popularity is a unilateral measure of acceptance by numerous peers. A popular child is liked by more children than he/she is disliked; a rejected child is disliked more than he/she is liked. Children can be popular yet have no reciprocal friends and be rejected with friends (Bukowski & Hoza, 1989). Thus, the two constructs should be kept separate in that they are conceptually and empirically separate.

Discussion of friendship in relation to other peers and to popularity help us to clearly articulate the aspects of the peer context that are theoretically important. This level of clarity is needed in future research certainly. Friends, according to our definition, are pairs of children who *reciprocally* nominate each other as friends, not simply children who are in the same classroom or interact together during a lesson. Reciprocity is of crucial theoretical importance in our definition of friendships because of the mutual trust inherent in a relationship where children *each* consider the other as a friend. Unilateral friendships, or definitions of friendships where one child nominates another as a friend but the other does not reciprocate, should not be characterized by the same levels of trust. Trust, and the corresponding synchronous interaction patterns, should differentiate this relationship from other, nonfriend, peer relationships. When peers trust each other, as friends do, they are more willing to disagree with each other and, in turn, to accommodate that discrepant information (Hartup, 1996). An example of this sort of disagreement and compromise was presented above in the dialogue between Anna and Jessica. It is the trust that operates in reciprocal friendships that is crucial if children are to disagree with each other and then compromise.

Conceptual conflict and compromise are emotionally charged events for young children (Dunn, 1988). These events are often characterized by children verbally encoding accompa-

nying emotional states with terms such as *happy*, *sad*, *disappointed*, and *angry* (Dunn, 1998). Encoding emotional states in language has the effect of cooling the emotions to a level where children can then reflect upon them (Dunn, 1988; Bruner, 1987). That is, by verbally encoding the emotions that accompany conceptual conflict and resolution, children make them emotionally less charged and can thereby step back from the interaction and reflect. This reflective process is crucial for children's reflection upon language and thought processes.

The empirical record supports these claims to the extent that interactions between friends, compared to acquaintances, tend to have more conflicts and resolutions, yet they are also more cooperative and sustained (Hartup, 1996), as well as contain more meta comments (Jones & Pellegrini, 1996). In a study of first-grade children's computer-assisted writing, Jones and Pellegrini (1996) found that friends, compared to nonfriends, not only used more meta terms but they also wrote more sophisticated narratives. Similarly, with a group of older primary school children, Daiute and colleagues (Daiute, Hartup, Shool, & Zajac, 1993) found that the oral language accompanying narrative writing and the written narratives themselves were more advanced in friendship than in acquaintanceship (dyads). Most interesting from our point of view was that Daiute and colleagues found that these forms of literate language co-occurred with markers of trust and emotion. The importance of peer trust in literacy learning is also reinforced by Lensmire's (1994) observations in his third-grade classroom writing lessons. Thus, friendship and the emotional support it affords seems crucial to the development of one form of early school-based literacy.

Implications

An important and initial research implication involves the definition of friendship. Given the centrality of reciprocity in our model, research should examine the role of unilateral and reciprocal friends. Our model predicts that reciprocal, compared to unilateral, friendships should evidence more trust and mutuality and, consequently, more conceptual conflict/resolution and literate language.

A second extension of this model would be to examine close relationships between children and teachers. By way of guidance, we consider children's attachment relationships with their primary caregivers, usually mothers (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wells, 1978). Interactions around storybooks between children and mothers in one form of close relationship, a secure attachment relationship, are coordinated and synchronized; these interactions, in turn, relate to emergent literacy (Bus & van-IJzendoorn, 1988; 1995). Secure attachment relationships (see Ainsworth et al., 1978 for an extended discussion of attachment classifications) occur when children use adults as secure bases from which to explore and interact with their environments. The trust manifested in securely attached relationships allows children to take risks and explore their worlds. Thus, in secure relationships, mothers ask children demanding questions about the book being read. Children and mothers both feel confident in each other during such difficult and possibly

stressful incidents (Bus & vanIJzendoorn, 1995).

Young children also seem to form attachment-like relationships with their teachers (Howes, Matheson, & Hamilton, 1994; Pianta & Nimetz, 1991). These interactions, too, are typified by mutual trust, respect, and coordination. Children classified as secure in their classrooms are generally socially competent in the classrooms, popular, and engaged in complex peer play (Howes et al., 1994). We do not know, however, about their interactions with teachers during literacy events. Evidence from the mother-child book reading literature provides some guidance as to what we should expect (Bus & vanIJzendoorn, 1995; Pellegrini, Perlmutter, Galda, & Brody, 1990). The atmosphere of trust should encourage teachers to use a variety of demanding but supportive teaching strategies. For example, when teachers are talking to children about books, they may begin by asking cognitively demanding questions (e.g., What do you think will happen next?). Children's responses to these questions should determine teachers' subsequent strategies. If children respond appropriately (e.g., He's gonna make too much spaghetti), teachers should continue with high demand strategies (How's he going to shut it off?). If children respond inappropriately (e.g., I don't know) teachers should lower their demands (e.g., Is he hungry?). Future research should address these issues directly with children and teachers in both secure and insecure relationships.

The role of individual differences in relationships should also be studied in the future. Human beings are individuals who enter into various relationships in different ways. These differences affect the contexts into which they self-select and the ways in which others interact with them. To minimize the role of individual differences in social interaction implies that individuals are rather passive recipients of larger social processes. This, as Tooby and Cosmides (1992) have argued so eloquently, is to reduce children's development and learning to a behaviorist variant of cultural reproduction. Consideration of individual differences makes provisions for individuals' contributions to social interaction. If we consider development to be transactional, rather than unidirectional, we must consider the exchange between individuals and larger social processes. Examinations of the role of individual differences and social relationships are especially important in the field of early literacy because they are noticeably absent from most socially-oriented theories of culture and development and especially absent from discussion of the social context of literacy instruction.

Individual differences are often considered in terms of children's temperament. Temperament is evident very early in children's development, stable across childhood, and has a biological (typically hormonal) expression (Suomi, 1991). Because of these characteristics, temperament is an excellent construct to use to examine the ways in which individuals contribute to socialization (Tooby & Cosmides, 1992). Here we consider one example, inhibited children (Billman & McDevitt, 1980; Kurdek & Lillie, 1985). These children are "slow to warm up" to different situations. When they do warm-up, however, they are social but less so than their more outgoing counterparts (Kochanska & Radke-Yarrow, 1992). These inhib-

ited children may be those who seek out a few close friends with whom to interact rather than more diverse and less intense relationships. Although their networks may be less diverse, their close friendships may be equally supportive of literacy learning. The important point here is the notion of equifinality (Martin & Caro, 1985), which states that there may be different, but equally effective, routes to developmental outcomes, such as literacy.

At the broader level, cultural variables, such as ethnicity, may influence children's friendship formations in school. Dubois and Hirsch (1990), for example, found that friends were particularly important for African-American boys and girls. They evidenced few of the gender differences observed in their European-American counterparts. Friendships seemed particularly important for African-American males, possibly to buffer their status in school. Future research into the differential role of relationships in school for different cultural groups is important in terms of equity (i.e., some members of these groups fail at rates higher than European-American children). Further, these differences are important to complement our understanding of children, relationships, and school in that most of our knowledge is based on middle-class children (Bronfennbrenner, 1979).

In conclusion, we presented a working model of one aspect of the social context of literacy learning. As noted above, specification of the dimensions of this model should not preclude other aspects of social context being examined. Indeed, a major motivation for our writing this paper was to stimulate discussion of these issues. Currently, there is wide recognition of the importance of social context. The time is right for a more direct and theoretically driven discussion of social context. The present paper is an initial and limited step in this direction.

References

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Walls, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baghban, M. (1984). *Our daughter learns to read and write*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Baghban, M. (1989). *You can help your young child with writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bernstein, B. (1960). Language and social class. *British Journal of Sociology, 2*, 217–276.

Billman, J., & McDevitt, S. (1980). Convergence of parent and observer rating of temperament with observations of peer interaction in nursery school. *Child Development, 51*, 395–400.

Bronfennbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1987, February). *Narrative thought and narrative language*. Invited talk at the Institute for Behavioral Research, University of Georgia, Athens.

Bukowski, W. M., & Hoza, B. (1989). Popularity and friendship: Issues in theory, measurement, and outcome. In T. Berndt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Peer relationships in child development* (pp. 15–45). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Burns, S. M., & Brainerd, C. J. (1979). Effects of constructive and dramatic play on perspective taking in very young children. *Developmental Psychology, 15*, 512–521.

Bus, A., & vanIJzendoorn, M. (1988). Mother-child interaction, attachment, and emergent literacy. *Child Development, 59*, 1262–1272.

Bus, A. G., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1995). Mothers reading to their 3-year-olds: The role of mother-child attachment security in becoming literate. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 998–1013.

Caldwell, B., & Bradley, R. (1984). *The HOME Inventory-Elementary*. Little Rock, AK: Unpublished ms.

Christie, J., & Johnsen, P. (1983). The role of play in social-intellectual development. *Review of Educational Research, 53*, 93–116.

Daiute, C., Hartup, W., Shool, W., & Zajac, R. (1993, March). *Peer collaboration and written language development: A study of friends and acquaintances*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans.

DeStefano, J.S. (1972). Some parameters of register in adult and child speech. *ITL, 18*, 31–45.

Dickinson, D., & Moreton, J. (1991, April). *Predicting specific kindergarten literacy skills from three-year-olds' preschool experience*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle.

Dubois, D., & Hirsch, B. (1990). School and neighborhood friendship patterns of Blacks and Whites in early adolescence. *Child Development, 61*, 524–536.

Dunn, J. (1988). *Social understanding*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dyson, A. H. (1989). *Multiple worlds of child writers: Friends learning to write*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dyson, A. H. (1993). *Social worlds of children learning to write*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Garvey, C. (1990). *Play*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Galda, L., Cullinan, B., & Strickland, D. (1993). *Language, literacy, and the child*. Ft. Worth: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Galda, L., Shockley, B., Pellegrini, A. D., & Stahl, S. (1995). Sharing lives: Reading, writing, talking, and living in one first-grade classroom. *Language Arts, 72*, 334–339.

Gottman, J. M. (1983). How children become friends. *Monographs for the Society for Research in Child Development, 48* (Serial 201, No. 3).

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Hartup, W. W. (1985). Relationships and their significance in child development. In R. A. Hinde, A. Perret-Clermont, & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Social relationships and cognitive development* (pp. 61–81). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: friendships and their developmental significance. *Child Development, 61*, 1–13.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hinde, R. A. (1978). On describing relationships. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*, 1–19.

Howes, C., Matheson, C. C., & Hamilton, C. E. (1994). Maternal, teacher, and child care history correlates of children's relationships with peers. *Child Development, 65*, 264–273.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of the interactions of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues, 23*, 8–28.

Jones, I., & Pellegrini, A. D. (1996) The effects of social relationships, writing media, and microgenetic development on first grade students' written narratives. *American Educational Reseacrh Journal, 33*, 691–718.

Kochanska, G., & Radke-Yarrow, M. (1992). Inhibition in toddlerhood and the dynamics of children's interactions with an unfamiliar peer at age 5. *Child Development, 63*, 325-335.

Kruger, A. C., Yebra, M., & Willis, M. (1995, April). *Task types affects style of peer interaction*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis.

Kurdek, L. A., & Lillie, R. (1985). Temperament, classmate likability, social perspective coordination as correlates of children's parent-rated Type A behaviors. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 6*, 73-83.

Lee, J. Y., & Walsh, M. (1995, April). *The relations of parents' and children's social networks to children's acceptance and behavior*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis.

Lensmire, T. (1994). *How children write*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships. *American Psychologist, 45*, 513-520.

Martin, P., & Caro, T. (1985). On the functions of play and its role in behavioral development. In J. Rosenblatt, C. Beer, M-C Bushnell, & P. Slater (Eds.), *Advances in the study of behavior* (pp. 59-103). New York: Academic.

McCandless, B. & Marshall, H. (1954). A picture sociometric technique for children and its relation to teacher judgements of friendship. *Child Development, 28*, 139-148.

Murray, F. (1972). Acquisition of conservation through social interaction. *Developmental Psychology, 6*, 1-6.

Olson, D. (1977). From utterance to text. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 257-281.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Galda, L. (1991). Longitudinal relations among preschoolers' symbolic play, metalinguistic verbs, and emergent literacy. In J. Christie (Ed.), *Play and early literacy development* (pp. 47-68). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pellegrini, A. D., Galda, L., Shockley, B., & Stahl, S. (1995). The nexus of social and literacy experiences at home and at school: Implications for primary school oral language and literacy. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 65*, 273-285 (a).

Pellegrini, A. D., Galda, L., Jones, I., & Perlmutter, J. C. (1995). Joint reading between Head Start children and their mothers: Vocabulary development in two text formats. *Discourse Processes, 19*, 441-463 (b).

Pellegrini, A. D., Perlmutter, J. C., Galda, L., & Brody, G. H. (1990). Joint book reading between Black Head Start children and their mothers. *Child Development, 61*, 443-453.

Perner, J., Ruffman, T., & Leekham, S. R. (1994). Theory of mind is contagious: You catch it from your sibs. *Child Development, 65*, 1228-1238.

Perret-Clermont, A., & Brossard, A. (1985). On the interdigitation of social and cognitive processes. In R. Hinde, A Perret-Clermont, & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Social relationships and cognitive development* pp. 309-327. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams, and imitation*. New York: Norton.

Piaget, J. (1983). Piaget's theory. In W. Kessen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 103-128). New York: Wiley.

Pianta, R., & Nimetz, S. L. (1991). Relationships between children and teachers: Associations with classroom and home behavior. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 12*, 379-393.

Rosen, C. E. (1974). The effects of sociodramtic play on problem solving behavior among culturally disadvantaged preschool children. *Child Development, 45*, 920-927.

Sackett, G. P., Sameroff, A. J., Cairns, R. B., & Suomi, S. J. (1981). Continuity in behavioral development: Theoretical and empirical issues. In K. Immelmann, G. Barlow, L. Petrinovich, & Main, M. (Eds.), *Behavioral Development* (pp. 23–57). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scarborough, H. S. (1995, April). *Long-term prediction of reading skills: Grade 2 to Grade 8*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). Learning to read culturally: Literacy before schooling. In H. Goelman, A. Oberg, & F. Smith (Eds.), *Awakening to literacy* (pp. 3–23). Exeter, NH: Heinnemann.

Slomkowowski, C. (1993, April). *Temperament and language: Relations from toddlerhood to middle childhood*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle.

Suomi, S. J. (1991). Early stress and emotional reactional reactivity in rhesus monkeys. In Ciba Foundation (Ed.), *The childhood environment and adult disease* (pp. 171–188). Chichester (UK): Wiley.

Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1992). The psychological foundations of culture. In J. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 19–136). New York: Oxford University Press.

vanAken, M. A. G. (1995, April). *Personality characteristics, psychological adjustment, and perceived social support in 12-year-olds*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Waldrop, M., & Halverson, C. (1975). Intensive and extensive peer behavior. *Child Development, 46*, 19–26.

NRRC National
Reading Research
Center

318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742